

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-22 are pending, Claims 9, 17 and 18 having been amended, and Claims 20-22 having been added by way of the present amendment. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; Claims 2-19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Guck (U.S. Patent No. 5,911,776, hereinafter Guck) in view of Putz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,210,824, hereinafter Putz) in further view of Astle (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,330, hereinafter Astle).

Claim 17 has been amended consistent with 35 U.S.C. § 101. However if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

The remarks included in the Amendment filed December 23, 2008 are believed to be equally applicable now, and therefore the entire contents of the Amendment filed December 23, 2008 is hereby incorporated by reference.

Claim 18 has been amended to further clarify that a content ID specifying unit is configured to specify a content ID of the predetermined content when the predetermined content is selected from a content list. The content ID represents the predetermined content in the content list. Non-limiting support is found in the file table of Figure 4, for example. Therefore, no new matter is added. Claim 18 also requires a selecting unit that selects one of the first file and the second file based on the first file ID and the second file ID acquired from the database when the content ID specified by the content ID specifying unit is associated with the first file ID and the second file ID. Thus, Claim 18 requires a content to be stored in at least two formats and corresponding content ID's for the formats to be displayed. A user may, from the display, select the content in the appropriate format to be transferred.

As discussed in detail in the Amendment filed December 23, 2008, Guck is directed to a device that provides the origination and storage of a “source” file and then identifies any one of a number of “shadow” files that are devoid of content (column 4, line 45), but are dedicated to a particular output format. Moreover, only one file is stored in a content file, and Guck employs “conversion filters”, which convert the documents authored in one specific format (column 4, lines 17-19) into an output content (column 16, lines 51-55). In this way, only one original document needs to be created by an author as a source file and the system in Guck relies on a file-converter group to translate the documents into other formats (see, e.g., Abstract).

Comparing amended Claim 18 with Guck, amended Claim 18 requires a content ID specifying unit configured to specify a content ID of the predetermined content when the predetermined content is selected from a content list, wherein the content ID represents the predetermined content in the content list. In contrast, Guck uses a source file as discussed above, and converts the source file into another format requested by a requestor. In Claim 18, the selecting unit selects one of the first file and the second file based on the first file ID and the second file ID acquired from the database when the content ID specified by the content ID specifying unit is associated with the first file ID and the second file ID. Guck does not employ a content ID specifying unit that selects one of the first file and the second file, nor does it display the content list from which a user selects the content to be transferred. Neither Astle nor Putz disclose these features that are also absent in Guck. Consequently, no matter how Guck, Putz and Astle are combined the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of amended Claim 18, and in particular, the content ID specifying unit and selecting unit, as claimed.

Claim 9 has similarly been amended to define a specifying step for specifying from a content list the predetermined content on the basis of the first data which represents the

predetermined content on the content list. Once again it is believed that this feature is absent in any of the asserted references and as a consequence it is believed that Claim 9, as amended, patentably defines over the asserted prior art.

Claim 17 is similar to Claim 9 although it is directed to a different statutory class, namely a computer readable storage medium. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 17 patentably defines over the asserted prior art for substantially the same reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 9.

New Claim 20 defines an information processing apparatus that, among other things, includes a selection unit configured to select a predetermined content identification by selecting one of the content identifications displayed on a display unit. An acquisition unit acquires a format from another information processing apparatus and is operable to operate in the another information processing apparatus a predetermined content file identified by the content identification. The transfer unit then transfers to the another information processing apparatus the predetermined content file specified by the predetermined content identification selected by the select unit in accordance with the format acquired by the acquisition unit. As discussed above, neither Guck nor Putz nor Astle teach or suggest determining into which format the requested file is selected based on its operability with another device and displaying the content list so a user can select the content to be transferred, as claimed. As Claim 21 depends on Claim 20 it is believed that Claim 21 patentably defines over the asserted prior art for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to Claim 20. Similarly, Claim 22 is directed to a different statutory class than Claim 20, but otherwise is believed to patentably define over the asserted prior art for the same reasons discussed above with regard to new Claim 20.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 2-22, as amended,

is statutory and patentably distinguishing over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Scott A. McKeown  
Registration No. 42,866